arXiv:math/0612395v1 [math.GM] 14 Dec 2006

On the Minimization of Operational Risks

V.P.Maslov[*]

Abstract

We give a risk-minimizing formula for government investments taking into account the zero intelligence law for financial markets.

A problem of reducing operational risks has the specific feature that the enterprises $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s$ in which the government is willing to invest are specified in advance, possibly for political reasons, on the basis of their profitability, or in accordance with general economic strategies. Here s is sufficiently large. Moreover, the government orders the enterprises by priority: for each i, the enterprise A_i is more promising than the enterprise A_{i-1}. This means that one should not buy more stock (bonds) of the enterprise A_{i-1} than of A_i. In other respects, one should distribute the money over these enterprises (buy stock) so as to minimize the operational risks. Governmental structures indicate the amounts of money to be invested in the highest priority enterprise A_s and the least priority enterprise A_1, and also set a budget restraint.

When solving this problem, we shall adhere to the concept of *zero intelligence* in financial markets. This concept arose in a study of the London Stock Exchange, and since then the literature discussing the phenomenon has been steadily growing. However, the zero intelligence phenomenon is quite natural from our viewpoint [1].

The effect is that traders use stock exchange data to form their portfolios at random ("without resorting to intelligence"). However, according to Kolmogorov, randomness is none other than large complexity. For example, it does not matter if we bet on heads or tails randomly or construct a long algorithm and stick to it: in any case, the coin lands on heads (and, accordingly, tails) approximately half of the times.

Let us continue the analogy. We toss a coin S times, where S is large, and repeat the series of S tossings N times. All possible outcomes, including "all heads" or "alternating heads and tails," are equiprobable (and have a tiny probability). But a majority of outcomes have approximately equal numbers of heads and tails. In particular, this means that if we play heads and tails and bet on heads and tails half of the times each, then the risk (and also the payoff) is minimal.

Consequently, returning to our problem, if we find the largest "cluster" of outcomes that are equiprobable by the zero intelligence principle, then the corresponding investment distribution will be safest, or risk-free.

Let C_i be the number of shares bought by the government investment agency from the i-th enterprise (bank). By assumption, we have the relations

$$C_{i+1} \geq C_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, s, \quad C_s \leq M, \ C_1 \geq K, \tag{1}$$

where M and K are given. Hence

$$C_s - C_1 \leq M - K. \tag{2}$$

---

[*] Moscow State University, Physics Department

Let p_i be the stock price for the ith enterprise and $N = M - k$. Obviously,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} C_i p_i \le C_s \sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i.$$

Hence the budget restraint Φ satisfies the relations

$$C_1 \sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i \le \sum_{i=1}^{s} C_i p_i \le \Phi \le C_s \sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i, \tag{3}$$

i.e., under this natural inequality on Φ one has

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} C_i p_i \le \Phi. \tag{4}$$

We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} C_i p_i \equiv \sum_{i=2}^{s} (C_i - C_{i-1}) \sum_{j=i}^{s} p_j + C_1 \sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i \le \Phi,$$

whence it follows that

$$\sum_{i=2}^{s} (C_i - C_{i-1}) \sum_{j=i}^{s} p_j \le \Phi - C_1 \sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i. \tag{5}$$

We set

$$N_i = C_i - C_{i-1}, \quad \lambda_i = \sum_{j=i}^{s} p_j. \tag{6}$$

Then

$$\sum_{j=2}^{i} N_j = C_i - C_1; \quad \lambda_i \le \lambda_{i-1} \le \dots \le \lambda_1; \ \lambda_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{s} p_s. \tag{7}$$

We obtain

$$\sum_{i=2}^{s} N_i \lambda_i \le \Phi - K \sum_{j=1}^{s} p_s. \tag{8}$$

Let $E = \Phi - \sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i K$.

Consider the set of all sequences $\{N_i\}$ such that

$$\sum_{i=2}^{s} N_i \lambda_i \le E. \tag{9}$$

Since all sequences $\{C_i\}$ satisfying conditions (1) and (2) are equiprobable, it follows that the sequences $N_i = C_i - C_{i-1}$; $i = 2, \dots, s$, satisfying the relation

$$\sum_{i=2}^{s} N_i = M - K = N, \tag{10}$$

are equiprobable under the condition $N_i \ge 0$ and condition (9).

We assume that $a_1 N \le s \le a_2 N$, a_1, a_2 are constants. We introduce the notation: $\mathcal{M}$ is the set of all sets $\{N_i\}$ satisfying conditions (9) and (10); $\mathcal{N}\{\mathcal{M}\}$ is the number of elements of the set $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 1 *Suppose that all the variants of sets* $\{N_i\}$ *satisfying the conditions (9) and (10) are equiprobable. Then the number of variants* $\mathcal{N}$ *of sets* $\{N_i\}$ *satisfying conditions (9) and (10) and the additional relation*

$$|\sum_{i=1}^{l} N_i - \sum_{1}^{l} \frac{q_i}{e^{\beta'\lambda_i - \nu'} - 1}| \geq N^{(3/4+\varepsilon)} \tag{11}$$

is less than $\frac{c_1 \mathcal{N}\{\mathcal{M}\}}{N^m}$ *(where* c_1 *and* m *are any arbitrary numbers,* $\sum_{i=1}^{l} q_i \geq \varepsilon Q$*, and* ε *is arbitrarily small).*

Proof of Lemma 1.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a subset of $\mathcal{M}$ satisfying the condition

$$|\sum_{i=l+1}^{s} N_i - \sum_{i=l+1}^{s} \frac{q_i}{e^{\beta\lambda_i - \nu} - 1}| \leq \Delta;$$

$$|\sum_{i=1}^{l} N_i - \sum_{i=1}^{l} \frac{q_i}{e^{\beta'\lambda_i - \nu'} - 1}| \leq \Delta,$$

where Δ, β, ν are some real numbers independent of l.

We denote

$$|\sum_{i=l+1}^{s} N_i - \sum_{i=l+1}^{s} \frac{q_i}{e^{\beta\lambda_i - \nu} - 1}| = S_{s-l};$$

$$|\sum_{i=1}^{l} N_i - \sum_{i=1}^{l} \frac{q_i}{e^{\beta'\lambda_i - \nu'} - 1}| = S_l.$$

Obviously, if $\{N_i\}$ is the set of all sets of integers on the whole, then

$$\mathcal{N}\{\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{A}\} = \sum_{\{N_i\}} \Big(\Theta(E - \sum_{i=1}^{s} N_i\lambda_i)\delta_{(\sum_{i=1}^{s} N_i),N}\Theta(S_l - \Delta)\Theta(S_{s-l} - \Delta)\Big), \tag{12}$$

where $\sum N_i = N$.

Here the sum is taken over all integers N_i, $\Theta(\lambda)$ is the Heaviside function, and δ_{k_1,k_2} is the Kronecker symbol.

We use the integral representations

$$\delta_{NN'} = \frac{e^{-\nu N}}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} d\varphi e^{-iN\varphi} e^{\nu N'} e^{iN'\varphi}, \tag{13}$$

$$\Theta(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\lambda \frac{1}{\lambda - i} e^{\beta y(1+i\lambda)}. \tag{14}$$

Now we perform the standard regularization. We replace the first Heaviside function Θ in (12) by the continuous function

$$\Theta_\alpha(y) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for} \quad \alpha > 1,\ y < 0 \\ 1 - e^{\beta y(1-\alpha)} & \text{for} \quad \alpha > 1,\ y \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

$$\Theta_\alpha(y) = \begin{cases} e^{\beta y(1-\alpha)} & \text{for} \quad \alpha < 0,\ y < 0 \\ 1 & \text{for} \quad \alpha < 0,\ y \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1, \infty)$ is a parameter, and obtain

$$\Theta_\alpha(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{\beta y(1+ix)} \left(\frac{1}{x-i} - \frac{1}{x-\alpha i}\right) dx. \tag{15}$$

If $\alpha > 1$, then $\Theta(y) \le \Theta_\alpha(y)$.

Let $\nu < 0$. We substitute (13) and (14) into (12), interchange the integration and summation, then pass to the limit as $\alpha \to \infty$ and obtain the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{N}\{\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{A}\} \le \\ &\le \Bigl|\frac{e^{-\nu N+\beta E}}{i(2\pi)^2} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \bigl[\exp(-iN\varphi) \sum_{\{N_j\}} \Bigl(\exp\bigl\{(-\beta \sum_{j=1}^{s} N_j \lambda_j) + (i\varphi + \nu)N_j\bigr\}\bigr]\, d\varphi \times \\ &\times \Theta(S_l - \Delta)\Theta(S_{s-l} - \Delta)\Bigr|, \ \sum N_i = N, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where β and ν are real parameters such that the series converges for them.

To estimate the expression in the right-hand side, we bring the absolute value sign inside the integral sign and then inside the sum sign, integrate over φ, and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}\{\mathcal{M} \setminus \mathcal{A}\} \le \frac{e^{-\nu N+\beta E}}{2\pi} \sum_{\{N_i\}} \exp\{-\beta \sum_{i=1}^{s} N_i \lambda_i + \nu N_i\} \times \\ \times \Theta(S_l - \Delta)\Theta(S_{s-l} - \Delta). \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

We denote

$$Z(\beta, N) = \sum_{\{N_i\}} e^{-\beta \sum_{i=1}^{s} N_i \lambda_i}, \tag{18}$$

where the sum is taken over all N_i such that $\sum_{i=1}^{s} N_i = N$,

$$\zeta_l(\nu, \beta) = \prod_{i=1}^{l} \xi_i\,(\nu, \beta)\,; \zeta_{s-l}(\nu, \beta) = \prod_{i=l+1}^{s} \xi_i\,(\nu, \beta)\,;$$

$$\xi_i(\nu, \beta) = \frac{1}{(1 - e^{\nu - \beta\lambda_i})^{q_i}}, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, l.$$

It follows from the inequality for the hyperbolic cosine $\cosh(x) = (e^x + e^{-x})/2$ for $|x_1| \ge \delta; |x_2| \ge \delta$:

$$\cosh(x_1)\cosh(x_2) > \frac{e^\delta}{2} \tag{19}$$

that the inequality

$$\Theta(S_{s-l} - \Delta)\Theta(S_l - \Delta) \le e^{-c\Delta} \cosh\Bigl(c \sum_{i=1}^{l} N_i - c\phi_l\Bigr) \cosh\Bigl(c \sum_{i=l+1}^{s} N_i - c\overline{\phi}_{s-l}\Bigr), \tag{20}$$

where

$$\phi_l = \sum_{i=1}^{l} \frac{q_i}{e^{\beta'\lambda_i - \nu'} - 1}; \qquad \overline{\phi}_{s-l} = \sum_{i=l+1}^{s} \frac{q_i}{e^{\beta\lambda_i - \nu} - 1},$$

holds for all positive c and Δ.

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{N}\{\mathcal{M}\setminus\mathcal{A}\} \le e^{-c\Delta}\exp\left(\beta E-\nu N\right)\times\\
&\times\sum_{\{N_i\}}\exp\{-\beta\sum_{i=1}^{l}N_i\lambda_i+\nu\sum_{i=1}^{l}N_i\}\cosh\left(\sum_{i=1}^{l}cN_i-c\phi\right)\times\\
&\times\exp\{-\beta\sum_{i=l+1}^{s}N_i\lambda_i+\nu\sum_{i=l+1}^{s}N_i\}\cosh\Big(\sum_{i=l+1}^{s}cN_i-c\overline{\phi}\Big)=\\
&=e^{\beta E}e^{-c\Delta}\times\\
&\times\left(\zeta_l(\nu-c,\beta)\exp(-c\phi_l)+\zeta_l(\nu+c,\beta)\exp(c\phi_l)\right)\times\\
&\times\left(\zeta_{s-l}(\nu-c,\beta)\exp(-c\overline{\phi}_{s-l})+\zeta_{s-l}(\nu+c,\beta)\exp(c\overline{\phi}_{s-l})\right). \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we use the relations

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\ln\zeta_l|_{\beta=\beta',\nu=\nu'}\equiv\phi_l;\ \frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\ln\zeta_{s-l}|_{\beta=\beta',\nu=\nu'}\equiv\overline{\phi}_{s-l} \qquad (22)$$

and the expansion $\zeta_l(\nu\pm c,\beta)$ by the Taylor formula. There exists a $\gamma<1$ such that

$$\ln(\zeta_l(\nu\pm c,\beta))=\ln\zeta_l(\nu,\beta)\pm c(\ln\zeta_l)'_\nu(\nu,\beta)+\frac{c^2}{2}(\ln\zeta_l)''_\nu(\nu\pm\gamma c,\beta).$$

We substitute this expansion, use formula (22), and see that $\phi_{\nu,\beta}$ is cancelled.

Another representation of the Taylor formula implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ln\left(\zeta_l(\nu+c,\beta)\right)=\ln\left(\zeta_l(\beta,\nu)\right)+\frac{c}{\beta}\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu}\ln\left(\zeta_l(\beta,\nu)\right)+\\
&+\int_\nu^{\nu+c/\beta}d\nu'(\nu+c/\beta-\nu')\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\nu'^2}\ln\left(\zeta_l(\beta,\nu')\right). \qquad (23)
\end{aligned}$$

A similar expression holds for ζ_{s-l}.

From the explicit form of the function $\zeta_l(\beta,\nu)$, we obtain

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\nu^2}\ln\left(\zeta_l(\beta,\nu)\right)=\beta^2\sum_{i=1}^{l}\frac{g_i\exp(-\beta(\lambda_i+\nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_i+\nu))-1)^2}\le\beta^2Qd, \qquad (24)$$

where d is given by the formula

$$d=\frac{\exp(-\beta(\lambda_1+\nu))}{(\exp(-\beta(\lambda_1+\nu))-1)^2}..$$

The same estimate holds for ζ_{s-l}.

Taking into account the fact that $\zeta_l\zeta_{s-l}=\zeta_s$, we obtain the following estimate for $\beta=\beta'$ and $\nu=\nu'$:

$$\mathcal{N}\{\mathcal{M}\setminus\mathcal{A}\}\le\zeta_s(\beta',\nu')\exp(-c\Delta+\frac{c^2}{2}\beta^2Qd)\exp(E\beta'-\nu'N). \qquad (25)$$

Now we express $\zeta_s(\nu',\beta')$ in terms $Z(\beta,N)$. To do this, we prove the following lemma 2.

Lemma 2 *Under the above assumptions, the asymptotics of the integral*

$$Z(\beta,N)=\frac{e^{-\nu N}}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}d\alpha e^{-iN\alpha}\zeta_s(\beta,\nu+i\alpha) \tag{26}$$

has the form

$$Z(\beta,N)=Ce^{-\nu N}\frac{\zeta_s(\beta,\nu)}{|(\partial^2\ln\zeta_s(\beta,\nu))/(\partial^2\nu)|}(1+O(\frac{1}{N})), \tag{27}$$

where C is a constant.

We have

$$Z(\beta,N)=\frac{e^{-\nu N}}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}e^{-iN\alpha}\zeta_s(\beta,\nu+i\alpha)\,d\alpha=\frac{e^{-\nu N}}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}e^{NS(\alpha,N)}d\alpha, \tag{28}$$

where

$$S(\alpha,N)=-i\alpha+\ln\zeta_s(\beta,\nu+i\alpha)=-i\alpha-\sum_{i=1}^{s}q_i\ln[1-e^{\nu+i\alpha-\beta\lambda_i}]. \tag{29}$$

Here S depends on N, because s, λ_i, and ν also depend on N; the latter is chosen so that the point $\alpha=0$ be a stationary point of the phase S, i.e., from the condition

$$N=\sum_{i=1}^{s}\frac{q_i}{e^{\beta\lambda_i-\nu}-1}. \tag{30}$$

We assume that $a_1N\le s\le a_2N$, $a_1,a_2=\text{const}$, and, in addition, $0\le\lambda_i\le B$ and $B=\text{const}$, $i=1,\dots,s$. If these conditions are satisfied in some interval $\beta\in[0,\beta_0]$ of the values of the inverse temperature, then all the derivatives of the phase are bounded, the stationary point is nondegenerate, and the real part of the phase outside a neighborhood of zero is strictly less than its value at zero minus some positive number. Therefore, calculating the asymptotics of the integral, we can replace the interval of integration $[-\pi,\pi]$ by the interval $[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]$. In this integral, we perform the change of variable

$$z=\sqrt{S(0,N)-S(\alpha,N)}. \tag{31}$$

This function is holomorphic in the disk $|\alpha|\le\varepsilon$ in the complex α-plane and has a holomorphic inverse for a sufficiently small ε. As a result, we obtain

$$\int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon}e^{NS(\alpha,N)}d\alpha=e^{NS(0,N)}\int_{\gamma}e^{-Nz^2}f(z)\,dz, \tag{32}$$

where the path γ in the complex z-plane is obtained from the interval $[-\varepsilon,\varepsilon]$ by the change (31) and

$$f(z)=\left(\frac{\partial\sqrt{S(0,N)-S(\alpha,N)}}{\partial\alpha}\right)^{-1}\Bigg|_{\alpha=\alpha(z)}. \tag{33}$$

For a small ε the path γ lies completely inside the double sector $\mathrm{re}(z^2)>c(\mathrm{re}\,z)^2$ for some $c>0$; hence it can be "shifted" to the real axis so that the integral does not change up to terms that are exponentially small in N. Thus, with the above accuracy, we have

$$Z(\beta,N)=\frac{e^{-\nu N}}{2\pi}\int_{-\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon}e^{-Nz^2}f(z)\,dz. \tag{34}$$

Since the variable z is now real, we can assume that the function $f(z)$ is finite (changing it outside the interval of integration), extend the integral to the entire axis (which again gives an exponentially small error), and then calculate the asymptotic expansion of the integral expanding the integrand in the Taylor series in z with a remainder. This justifies that the saddle-point method can be applied to the above integral in our case. The proof of the lemma 1 is complete.

Now we estimate $Z(\beta, N)$. To do this, we proof the following lemma 3.

Lemma 3 *The quantity*

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})}\sum_{\{N_i\}} e^{-\beta\sum_{i=1}^s N_i\lambda_i}, \tag{35}$$

where $\sum N_i = N$ *and* $\lambda_i N_i \le E - N^{1/2+\varepsilon}$, *tends to zero faster than* N^{-k} *for any* k, $\varepsilon > 0$.

We consider the point of minimum in β of the right-hand side of (21) with $\nu(\beta, N)$ satisfying the condition

$$\sum \frac{q_i}{e^{\beta\lambda_i - \nu(\beta,N)} - 1} = N.$$

It is easy to see that it satisfies condition (9). Now we assume that the assumption of the lemma is not satisfied.

Then for $\sum N_i = N$, $\sum \lambda_i N_i \ge E - N^{1/2+\varepsilon}$, we have

$$e^{\beta E}\sum_{\{N_i\}} e^{-\beta\sum_{i=1}^s N_i\lambda_i} \ge e^{(N^{1/2}+\varepsilon)\beta}.$$

Obviously, $\beta \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$ provides a minimum of (21) if the assumptions of Lemma 1 are satisfied, which contradicts the assumption that the minimum in β of the right-hand side of (21) is equal to β'.

We set $c = \frac{\Delta}{N^{1+\alpha}}$ in formula (25) after the substitution (27); then it is easy to see that the ratio

$$\frac{\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M}\setminus\mathcal{A})}{\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{M})} \approx \frac{1}{N^m},$$

where m is an arbitrary integer, holds for $\Delta = N^{3/4+\varepsilon}$. The proof of the lemma 1 is complete.

From (6) - (8) follows

1 *A risk-free investment (stock purchase) under conditions (1)– (3) takes place if*

$$C_i = C_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{i}\frac{1}{e^{\beta\sum_{k=j}^s p_k - \sigma} - 1} + O(N^{3/4});\ i > \delta N,\ \delta > 0, \tag{36}$$

where σ *and* β *are determined from the conditions*

$$\sum_{j=2}^{s}\frac{1}{e^{\beta\sum_{k=j}^s p_k - \sigma} - 1} = M - K;\quad \sum_{i=2}^{s} p_i \sum_{j=2}^{i}\frac{1}{e^{\beta\sum_{k=j}^s p_k - \sigma} - 1} = \Phi - p_1 K.$$

References

[1] V. P. Maslov, ”On the increasing complexity principle in portfolio formation at stock exchange”, Dokl. Ross. Akad. Nauk [Russian Acad. Sci. Dokl. Math.], 404 (2005), no. 4, 446-450.

[2] V. P. Maslov. The nonlinear average in economics. // Mat. Zametki [Math. Notes]. 2005, **78**, No. 3, 377–395.